



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—THE INTRODUCTION OF MASKS ON THE ROMAN STAGE.¹

If ancient testimony concerning the introduction of masks on the Roman stage were as consistent as it is abundant, one of the troublesome problems in the history of the Roman theater would never have arisen. The passage most often quoted on the subject is from Diomedes² (Keil, Gramm. Lat., I. 489): antea itaque galearibus, non personis utebantur, ut qualitas coloris indicium faceret aetatis, cum essent albi aut nigri aut rufi. Personis vero uti primus coepit Roscius Gallus, praecipuus histrio, quod oculis perversis³ erat nec satis decorus in personis⁴ nisi parasitus pronuntiabat. The uncertainties of the text in this passage seem not to affect the plain statement that Roscius was the first to begin the use of masks among the Romans.⁵ It is, therefore,

¹ In a recent attempt to bring together all the available evidence concerning Costume in Roman Comedy (Columbia University Press, 1909) I was obliged by the large amount of material involved to omit a discussion of the use of masks. From time to time various phases of this question have been treated in special papers and dissertations, but a convenient and complete summary of the present status of the question I have been unable to discover, even in van Wageningen, *Scaenica Romana* (Groningen, 1907). Such a summary I have attempted to give in this paper, with appropriate comment.

² Diomedes's sources seem to have been Suetonius and Varro (see Teuffel-Schwabe, *Röm. Lit.*, I⁵. 29; Ribbeck, *Röm. Trag.* 661). Cf. the parallel passages in Suetonius (Reifferscheid, *Reliquiae*, p. 11): both Suetonius and Diomedes quote Varro in their discussion of *comoedia*, of which these two passages form a part.

³ *Eversis* A B M, *obversis* S: *perversis* scripsit Keilius ex Cic. de Nat. Deor. I 28. 79 at erat (Roscius), sicut hodie est, oculis perversissimis.

⁴ *Nec satis decorus nisi personatus* coniecit Reuversius Collect. Litt. p. 10 *sine personis* Langius Vind. Trag. Rom. p. 43. Hofferus (De Personarum Usu in Comoediis Terenti, p. 10) *sine personis* legit, Suetonium (l. c.) secutus. *Visi* om. M.

⁵ At least, no such uncertainty is indicated by Keil. However, Naumann says (De Personarum Usu in Terentii Comoediis, p. 3): Sed quoniam totus ille locus (i. e., apud Diomedem) in codicibus misere corruptus est, quam errorem a Diomede ad Suetonium a Suetonio ad Varronem referre hominemque doctissimum et diligentissimum manifestae insimulare negligentiae, multo

most natural to expect further evidence on the subject from the actor's distinguished pupil, Cicero, and scholars have collected from the orator's works at least four passages which bear more or less directly on the matter.

In *De Oratore* 3. 59. 221 Crassus is made to say: *sed in ore sunt omnia. In eo autem ipso dominatus est omnis oculorum: quo melius nostri illi senes, qui personatum ne Roscium quidem magno opere laudabant.* That is, Crassus, speaking in 91 B. C., refers to the old men of the time as having refused to approve even Roscius, when he acted *personatus*. It seems a fair inference that to these disapproving *senes* the use of masks was an innovation: but as Naumann speedily pointed out (l. c., p. 2), by no means inevitable is Hoffer's further inference (l. c., pp. 4-7) that this unpopular innovation had crystallized into uniform practice by 91 B. C. or even by 55 B. C. (the probable date of the composition of the *De Oratore*). However, in confirmation of this view, Hoffer proceeds to cite another passage from the *De Oratore* (2. 46. 193), where Cicero warns the orator that he must himself feel the emotion which he desires to excite: *Sed, ut dixi, ne hoc in nobis <= nobis oratoribus> mirum videatur, quid potest esse tam fictum quam versus, quam scaena, quam fabulae? Tamen in hoc genere saepe ipse vidi ut ex persona mihi ardere oculi hominis histrionis viderentur, etc.* Again, the inference that the use of the mask was uniform when these words were written is tempting but unjustifiable.¹ Even less satisfactory for Hoffer's purpose are the words in *De Div.* 1. 37. 80: *Quid vestra oratio in*

probabilius est inter *coepit* et *Roscium* olim Minucium Prothymum et Cincium Faliscum, quos Donatus de *Com. extr.* primos tradit fabulas personatos egisse, fuisse nominatos Naumann seems here to have confused the passage from Diomedes with the parallel passage from Suetonius, the latter of which is preceded and followed by lacunae.

¹ It may further be objected that this passage, as, probably, the next (*De Div.* 1. 37. 80) also, has reference to tragedy and not to comedy. From the available evidence it seems impossible to say whether masks were introduced earlier at Rome on the comic or on the tragic stage. Ribbeck argues (*Röm. Trag.* 660-662; 672) that masks were first used on the tragic stage, but he has probably misinterpreted his evidence in this respect (see below p. 61, especially n. 6). In the *Festus* passage discussed below, pp. 64-5, *comoedi* are mentioned before *tragoedi* and in Euanthius (*De Com.* VI. 3) comedy is mentioned before tragedy: but that order is perhaps not significant, especially since it is probable that in the Euanthius passage the names of the innovators have been reversed.

causis? quid ipsa actio? potest esse vehemens, et gravis, et copiosa, nisi est animus ipse commotior? Equidem etiam in te saepe vidi et (ut ad leviora veniamus) in Aesopo familiari tuo tantum ardorem vultuum atque motuum, ut eum vis quaedam abstraxisse a sensu mentis videretur. Now, this passage is generally cited to show that the use of masks was *not* constant in Cicero's time, but Hoffer disposes of the obvious difficulty by suggesting (1) that Aesopus's mask might have been so constructed as to depict his excited mental state, *vultus* thus being used in a transferred sense, or (2) that Quintus, having in mind at the outset not so much the actor's as the orator's action, suddenly turns the course of his thought aside to Aesopus and applies to the actor what he had intended to apply only to Cicero.

The fourth and last of the important passages from Cicero is to be found in *De Nat. Deor.* i. 28. 79: Q. Catulus, huius collegae et familiaris nostri pater, dilexit municipem tuum Roscium; in quem etiam illud est eius

Constiteram exorientem Auroram forte salutans

Cum subito a laeva Roscius exoritur.

Pace mihi liceat, caelestes, dicere vestra;

Mortalis visust pulchrior esse deo.

Huic deo pulchrior: at erat, sicuti hodie est, perversissimis oculis. Quid refert, si hoc ipsum salsum illi et venustum videbatur? The assumption that Roscius is here described as acting on the stage seems to me to be unwarranted,¹ but Hoffer so interprets the situation,² and concludes that when this epigram was written Roscius could not have adopted the habit of playing *personatus*; furthermore, the generation of the elder Catulus³ would fit in well with that of the disapproving *senes* in *De Orat.* 3. 59. 221.

If our evidence stopped here with the testimony of Cicero, Suetonius and Diomedes, we might regret its incompleteness, but, at least we should not be troubled by any glaring incon-

¹ There is a bare possibility that Roscius, if not here represented as acting on the stage, is practising without a mask for the stage, since he is cited by Valerius Maximus (8. 7. 7) as one of the great men of history who were examples of *studium* and *industria*, inasmuch as he employed no gesture in public performances which he had not practised at home.

² This view seems probable to Ribbeck also: see *Röm. Trag.* 671, n. 136.

³ This Catulus died in the Marian proscription in 87 B. C.

sistency. However, quite as positive as the statements which Suetonius and Diomedes make concerning Roscius are three other statements of Donatus and Euanthius, which not only contradict the assertion of Suetonius and Diomedes but even disagree among themselves.¹ The first comes from the *locus classicus* of our knowledge of Roman stage presentations, Euanthius de Comoedia (VI. 3.): Personati primi egisse dicuntur comoediam Cincius Faliscus, tragoediam Minucius Prothymus. The second is from Donatus, Praef. ad Eun. 6: Acta plane est ludis Megalensibus L. Postumio L. Cornelio aedilibus curulibus,² agentibus etiam tunc personatis L. Minucio Prothymo L. Ambivio Turpione, item modulante Flacco Claudii tibiis dextra et sinistra ob iocularia multa permixta gravitati. The third passage is from another Praefatio of Donatus—that of the Adelphoe (6): haec sane acta est ludis scaenicis funebribus L. Aemili Pauli³ agentibus L. Ambivio et L. <Minucio Prothymo>,⁴ qui cum suis gregibus etiam tum personati agebant.

In the first passage (Euanthius de Com. VI. 3) the writer seems to have reversed the provinces of Cincius Faliscus and Minucius Prothymus, for the second passage and probably the third also associate the latter with comedy.⁵ The connection of Minucius Prothymus with the introduction of masks Ribbeck (Röm. Trag., 660-661) proposed to reconcile with Diomedes's statement by suggesting that Minucius Prothymus may have been the stage-manager under whom Roscius first acted *personatus*.⁶ Such a supposition seemed not impossible, for Dziatzko

¹ If all attempts to reconcile the testimony of Donatus and Euanthius with that of Cicero, Suetonius and Diomedes prove unsuccessful, the latter should certainly have the greater claim on our confidence, especially if Diomedes and Suetonius go back ultimately to Varro (cf. above, p. 58, n. 2). See, however, van Wageningen, *Scaenica Romana*, p. 35: Nobis difficile est hanc solvere quaestionem atque diiudicare utri maior fides habenda sit, Diomedii an Donato, quod uterque locuples auctor est.

² In 161 B. C.

³ In 160 B. C.

⁴ *Minucio Prothymo* supplevit Wilmanns: * * * * V, om. A C.

⁵ See Schanz, *Röm. Litteraturgesch.*,³ Müller's Hdb. VIII. I. 1, 230 (1906), and van Wageningen, *Scaenica Romana*, pp. 34-35.

⁶ It was, however, in Ribbeck's opinion the *tragic* stage on which Roscius and Minucius Prothymus introduced the use of masks. His authority seems to be, apart from the passage above cited from Euanthius (De Com. VI. 3), the tradition that Roscius, though especially fine in comedy, was also a successful actor of tragedy (Röm. Trag., 661 ff.; 108). But his great pre-

had shown that Minucius Prothymus brought out the Adelphoe in post-Terentian times (Rh. Mus. 20. 589, 591) and Ribbeck (Röm. Trag., 661) regards Minucius Prothymus as belonging most probably to the period of Accius.¹ If we grant this date for Minucius Prothymus, the only other difficulty with Ribbeck's explanation is that it seems to leave unaccounted for the mention of Ambivius Turpio, which Donatus makes in both the Praefationes above quoted; but this difficulty is obviated, if, again, we agree with Dziatzko (Rh. Mus. 21. 68, 82) that the three actors mentioned in connection with each play in the Donatus Praefationes and in the Terentian Didascaliae² had to do with *different* presentations of the respective plays. Hoffer suggests that in the beginning the introduction of masks was probably assigned to Minucius Prothymus alone and only later to Ambivius Turpio, when the names of the successive managers had been confused in Praefationes and Didascaliae.³ He adds, as further evidence that Ambivius Turpio could hardly have employed masks, the words from Cicero De Sen. 48⁴ to the effect that Ambivius especially delighted the spectators *in prima cavea*, a thing which Hoffer regards as very unlikely, in the light of De Orat. 3. 59. 221, if Ambivius Turpio had played *personatus*. But here, again, Hoffer is interpreting the text arbitrarily to suit his purpose, for the delight of the audience *in prima cavea* may have been due simply to *hearing* Roscius better; or, if the

eminence in comedy (see Quint. 11. 1. 3.), along with the distinct mention of the rôle of the parasite, seems to indicate that comedy was certainly not *less* in the mind of Diomedes than was tragedy. See above, p. 59, n. 1.

¹Leo, speaking of Atilius Praenestinus as the probable successor of L. Ambivius Turpio in the production of Terence's plays (Rh. Mus. 38, 242), adds: "Dass Minucius Prothymus jünger war ist eine durchaus gerechtfertigte Annahme".

²Egere L. Ambivius Turpio L. Atilius Praen.—Didascalia Eunuchi Egere L. Atilius Praen. L. Ambivius Turpio.—Didascalia Adelphorum.

³Similar is the view of Leo (Rh. Mus. 38. 343), though his grounds are different; "Mir will scheinen, dass Donat sich durch sein 'etiam tum' selbst verräth. Ihm ist das richtige bekannt, aber er fühlt sich durch irgend einen andern Umstand zu einem trügerischen Schluss veranlasst. So ist die Antwort gegeben: Donat kannte die Scenenbilder, in denen die Schauspieler maskirt dargestellt u. denen die Maskengruppen vorausgeschickt sind, er schloss aus den Illustrationen auf die Zeit des Dichters".

⁴Praepone Ambivio magis delectatur qui in prima cavea spectat, delectatur tamen etiam qui in ultima . . . The date of this dialogue is supposed to be 150 B. C.

literal meaning of *spectat* is insisted upon, it may have been merely his gestures and general bearing which they delighted to watch and not necessarily his facial expression (cf. *De Orat.* i. 59. 251).

Ribbeck's attempt to reconcile the introduction of masks by Roscius with Donatus's statements about Minucius Prothymus had apparently been generally accepted as the best explanation available until recently, when van Wageningen (*Scaenica Romana*, pp. 35-41) protested against the idea that these actors were contemporaries. His argument runs as follows: Ambivius Turpio was an old man in 160 B. C., when he spoke the prologue of the *Hecyra*,¹ though he was still acting most acceptably to his audiences in 150 B. C.² Supposing him to have died shortly after this and Atilius Praenestinus, his successor in presenting Terence's plays, to have flourished about twenty years (150 B. C.—130 B. C.), Minucius Prothymus, who succeeded Atilius, ought probably to be assigned to the years 130-110 B. C. Now, the *senes* to whom Crassus refers in 91 B. C. probably saw players acting without masks about forty years before,³ i. e. in the neighborhood of 131 B. C., which would easily allow the introduction of masks to fall into the period assumed for Minucius Prothymus (130-110 B. C.). But Roscius, who died a *senex* in 63 or 62 B. C.,⁴ was probably born about 135 B. C., in which case he could hardly have made any great innovation on the stage before 115 B. C. Even if we grant this chronology of van Wageningen, which is almost pure speculation, it does not make impossible Ribbeck's theory that Roscius may have been, for a time at least, in the *grex* of Minucius Prothymus; but van Wageningen believes that there is ground to suppose that Minucius Prothymus introduced masks at Rome much earlier than 115 B. C.—viz. about 130 B. C. He bases his opinion on a passage from Tacitus (*Ann.* 14. 21),⁵ where it is said that the *ludi* were especially elaborate

¹ Orator ad vos venio ornatu prologi :

sinite exorator sim, eodem ut iure uti *senem*
liceat, quo iure sum usus adulescentior.

—*Hec. Prol.* 9-11.

² See p. 62, n. 4.

³ See below, p. 71, n. 2.

⁴ *Cic. Pro Archia*, 17.

⁵ *Maiores quoque non abhorruisse spectaculorum oblectamentis pro fortuna quae tum erat, eoque a Tuscis accitos histriones, a Thuriis equorum certamina: et possessa Achaia Asiaque ludos curatius editos, nec quemquam*

after the conquests of Achaia (146 B. C.) and of Asia (130 B. C.), theatrical representations being expressly mentioned in connection with the brilliant triumph of L. Mummius in 145 B. C. Along with the plunder brought from the East after these conquests were numerous slaves, many of whom were not improbably actors. And so van Wageningen suggests that Minucius Prothymus, with his Greek *cognomen* and his possible floruit of 130-110 B. C., was the *Greek manager* who attempted to introduce masks at Rome, but that not until a *Roman actor*, Roscius, adopted the custom was it really accepted by the Romans, in whose minds, therefore, Roscius stood as the real innovator.

There remains to be considered one other general statement by Donatus—a comment on *Andria* IV. 3. 1: *haec scaena administrationem doli habet, quo fit ut deterreatur Chremes filiam suam Pamphilo dare. Et vide non minimas partes in hac comoedia Mysidi attribui, hoc est personae femineae, sive haec personatis viris agitur, ut apud veteres, sive per mulierem, ut nunc videmus.* The evidence to be derived from this passage depends, of course, on the interpretation of *apud veteres*, a phrase which Hoffer says (p. 32), judging from its use in other Donatus passages, may refer to any period before the time of Augustus. It is also true that Tacitus (*Dial.* 15-19) and Quintilian (9. 3. 1) use *veteres* and *antiqui* in opposition to *nostri* (contemporaneous writers), much as we set 'classical' or 'ante-classical' over against 'post-classical'.¹ Hence, the comment of Donatus avails equally little for those who claim, with Hoffer, that masks were introduced between the time of Terence and that of Cicero, and for those who think that even in Plautus's day masks were used by men when they played women's parts. The scales might be turned in favor of the later date by a passage from Festus, if only we could trust Mueller's reading² but the *quaedam Naevi* of

Romae honesto loco ortum ad theatrales artes degeneravisse, ducentis iam annis a L. Mummii triumpho qui primus id genus spectaculi in urbe prae-buerit. Sed et consultum parsimoniae quod perpetua sedes theatro locata sit potius quam immenso sumptu singulos per annos consurgeret ac destrueretur.

¹ See Archaism in Aulus Gellius, by Professor Charles Knapp, *Drisler Studies*, pp. 129-132.

² *Personata fabula quaedam Naevi inscribitur, quam putant quidam primum† a personatis histrionibus. sed cum post multos annos† comoedi et tragoedi personis uti coeperunt, verisimilius est eam fabulam propter inopiam comoedorum actam novam per Atellanos, qui proprie vocantur personati, quia ius*

Mueller's text is so far uncertain that Thewrewk de Ponor reads merely *quaedam ne ut*¹ (*Personata fabula quaedam ne ut† inscribitur, quam putant quidam primum† a personatis histrionibus*).

In view of the uncertain results yielded by all the passages which we have thus far considered, Hoffer set to work to examine the Donatus commentary in detail, collecting from it eighty passages (l. c., pp. 23-30) which seemed to him to show that a change of facial expression was being suggested by the scholiast. There is, however, grave question as to the value of some of these passages for Hoffer's argument. Thus, the literal meaning of *vultuose* can hardly be pressed in view of comments like that on And. I. 2. 13 (*more servili et vernili gestu: sic enim vocati a dominis secum vultuose agunt*) or that on And. II. 1. 32 (*interposita distinctione vultuose hoc dicitur, hoc est cum gestu*).² On the other hand, it must be conceded that a very large number of the passages, if taken quite simply and naturally, seem to imply unimpeded facial expression: cf., e. g., the comment on *nihil quidem* (Eun. II. 2. 42), *dicens 'nihil' mutavit vultum Parmeno in laetitia*; on Eun. V. 8. 7, *hoc vultu mutato et conturbato dicitur*; on Hec. IV. 4. 103, *melius pronuntiaveris si renitente et improbante hoc vultu dicere acceperis Philippum, quasi non oporteat interesse socerum*. Whether these scholia are of sufficiently early origin to furnish evidence for the theater of the Republican period is, of course, a moot question. At one ex-

est is non cogi in scaena ponere personam, quod ceteris histrionibus pati necesse est. So Mueller's *Festus*, p. 217 a. In l. 1 Mueller would insert *actam* after *primum*, and in l. 2 *acta sit quam* after *annos*. Better than Mueller's *acta sit quam* seems to be the simple change of *coeperunt* to *coeperint* which Hoffer (l. c., p. 18) suggests. The passage is thus interpreted by Munk, *De Fabulis Atellanis*, p. 70: "Festi sententia quam sane paulo negligentius expressit sive potius excerpsit haec est. Naeviana quaedam fabula personata dicta est, quia ab Atellanis est acta; Atellani vero Naevii tempore personati dicti sunt, quia tum soli personis utebantur: nunc vero etiam i. e. eo tempore quo Verrius Flaccus vixit sive quem alium exscripsit Festus, proprie personati vocantur, licet ceteri quoque histriones personati prodeant, quia ius est iis non cogi personam ponere quod ceteris histrionibus pati necesse est".

¹ See also Keil, *Rh. Mus.* VI. 616.

² Wessner prints *hoc est cum gestu* in italics. In his *Praefatio*, p. xlvii, he says: "Inclinatis autem litteris reddi ea imprimis volui, quibus integrum scholium in duas vel plures partes disiectum esse videbatur: hic illic etiam parva additamenta (cf. And. prol. 6²; 16³; 24²; 25³; I. 1. 1⁶; 2¹; al.) eodem typorum genere exprimenda curavi".

treme stands Sittl who holds that the commentator is not writing for actors at all but for the students of rhetoric and the professional declaimers of his own day,¹ at the other extreme that whole school of Donatus critics from Schopen down who believe that the Donatus scholia on scenic action do really go back to an early source.²

Of the available literary evidence it only remains to examine the extant comedies themselves in the light of two questions: (1) Are there any situations in the comedies of Plautus and Terence which demand the use of masks? (2) Are there any situations in those comedies which indicate that Plautus and Terence intended them to be acted without masks?

To the first question we may answer unqualifiedly "No". That women's parts were from the first taken by masked men used to be held³ on the authority of the Donatus passage (ad And. IV. 3. 1) above discussed. Similarly, before the dissertation of Hoffer (see p. 1, n. 4) it seems to have been commonly believed that masks were used for those rôles on the confusion of which the point of a play turned, e. g., for the two brothers in the *Menaechmi* and for Jupiter and *Amphitruo*, Mercury and *Sosia* in the *Amphitruo*. That such pairs of actors may have worn masks is, of course, possible: that it actually was the case

¹"Was von ihm selbst (i. e. Donatus) herrührt, hat für die Bühnenalterthümer keinen Wert, weil zu seiner Zeit längst keine Terenzische Komödien mehr aufgeführt wurden. Daraus ist nun nicht der weitere Schluss zu ziehen, die Gestenscholia müssten alt sein: denn der Terenzcommentar zielt augenscheinlich auf den rhetorischen Unterricht ab. Nun werden wir bald zeigen, dass auch bei der privaten Deklamation die Mimik nicht fehlte. Donat schreibt also weder für Schauspieler noch nach Komikern, sondern als öffentlicher Professor der Rhetorik, weshalb er auch über die Miene Vorschriften giebt, welche doch für die maskentragenden Schauspieler keinen Wert hatten". So Sittl, *Die Gebärden der Griechen u. Römer*, 203.

²The scenic character of a large part of the Donatus scholia is defended by Dr. J. W. Basore in a Johns Hopkins University dissertation entitled *The Scholia on Hypokrisis in the Commentary of Donatus* (Baltimore, 1908), pp. 4-10.

³See, e. g., Lorenz, *Most. Einl.* 15, and Wagner, *Hauton* (Berlin, 1892), *Einl.* 16. This view is repudiated by Lorenz in his second edition of the *Mostellaria* (1883), *Einl.* 6, *Krit. Anm.* 196: van Wageningen in his chapter *De Personis sive Larvis* (*Scaenica Romana*, p. 34) says: "De feminis nihil constat, sed verisimile est actores, qui olim partes muliebres agebant, facie fucata, capillis cultioribus (*δγκω*), manibus gypsatis in scaenam prodisse (cf. Varro, *Eumenides fr. XLIII*: Cic. ad Fam. 7. 6. 1).

is improbable, if all the other actors in the piece played without masks: for, granted a somewhat close resemblance of form and feature in the two actors playing such rôles, masks were certainly not a necessity to the ancients, who evidently knew the use of a large number of cosmetics (cf. Lorenz's note on *Most.* 264).¹ Witness also the modern stage-conventions in a play like the *Comedy of Errors*, of which the *Menaechmi* is the prototype. There are numerous other cases in Roman Comedy in which the disguise is an important factor in the plot, but often no very close resemblance between the counterfeiter and the counterfeited is necessary, for neither is actually known to the person to be deceived. Thus, (a) in the *Asinaria*, Leonida Servus pretends to the strange Mercator to be Saurea Atriensis, but neither Leonida nor Saurea is personally known to the Mercator; (b) in the *Captivi*, both master and slave are strangers to their captors so that neither captive's face would reveal his real identity; (c) in the *Curculio*, the parasite pretends to be Summanus, the freedman of Therapontigonus Miles, but he is a stranger, and needs nothing to conceal his face. More difficult, if indeed we admit any difficulty at all in effecting disguises without masks, are cases like the following: (1) in the *Casina*, a man, an *armiger*, disguised as a woman, *Casina*, is to be given in marriage to the *vilicus*: (2) in the *Persa*, Sagaristio Servus is disguised as a *peregrinus* and brings in the *Virgo* disguised as a *Persa*. In these cases, however, the disguise was, of course, helped out by the more voluminous robes worn by women and Orientals.

The word *persona* occurs in the *Persa* (783) and in *Eunuchus* Prol. 26, 32, 35; but in the Terentian passages it evidently means 'rôle', 'character', and in the Plautus passage² merely

¹ That the audience was not very exacting in some details of stage-convention may be inferred from situations like that in the *Menaechmi*, where, in order to make the confusion of the two brothers possible, we must assume (1) that the travelling *Menaechmus* did not wear *vestis peregrina* at all (though he had *pedisequi* and baggage), or (2) that he wore *vestis peregrina* and nobody cared, not even Plautus, or (3) that those who noticed the difference in costume between the two brothers regarded it merely as one of *Menaechmus's* jokes (see 317-318, 405, 825).

² *Merc.* 17 is very corrupt; even as emended in the *Triumvirate* edition (= *Merc.* 4) it is of no use for our purpose. Neither Lindsay's actual text nor his suggested readings show *persona* at all.

disguise.¹ *Larva* does not occur in Terence, according to Westerhov's Index; in Plautus² it seems to be employed only in expressions of contempt and reproach.

Less positive must be the answer to the second question—"Are there any situations in the comedies which indicate that Plautus and Terence intended them to be acted without masks?" Although there are several passages which tempt the reader to answer in the affirmative, the only one which points strongly to such an answer is Phormio 209-212:

AN. Obsecro,
quid si adsimulo, satin est? GE. Garris. AN. Voltum contem-
plamini: em,
satine sic est? GE. Non. AN. Quid si sic? GE. Propemodum.
AN. Quid sic? GE. Sat est.
em istuc serva.

Here the natural inference is that Antipho changed his expression gradually, which he could not have done *personatus*.³ That

¹ Cf. Walde, p. 463: "*Persona*, 'die Rolle, der Charakter einer Person; Larve, Maske des Schauspielers; Person': sowohl gegen die Auffassung als 'die von der Stimme durchschallte Maske' (*per* u. *sonare*; Corssen, Ausspr. I², 482 f., II², 64, 294, wie schon Gellius) als gegen die Annahme von verstümmelter Entlehnung aus Gr. *πρόσωπον* (Keller Volkset. 126) spricht, dass der Ausdruck *persōnāta* *fābula* älter ist als der Gebrauch der Masken, also nicht von der Bedeutung 'Maske' auszugehen ist. Vielmehr von **persōnāre*, -*zōnāre*, 'verkleiden' (aus Gr. *ζώνη* u. s. w.; *zōnātim* bei Lucil., *sōna*=*ζώνη* bei Plaut., *sōnārius* bei Nov.): *persōnāti* 'verkleidete Leute', *persōnāta* *fābula* 'Schauspiel in Verkleidung', daraus rückgebildet *persōna* 'Verkleidung' (Stowasser Wiener Stud. XII, 156). Nicht überzeugend Wiedemann BB. XXVIII, 18, Wz.* *perk-* 'umschliessen', s. *compesco*".

² It is found in Am. 777, Aul. 642, Cap. 598, Cas. 592, Merc. 981, 983: *larvatus* occurs in Men. 890 and M. G. 217 (Triumv. Edit.).

³ C. A. Boettiger (Opuscula [1837], pp. 231 sqq.) seems to have believed that Antipho may have worn a mask which allowed a slight motion of lips and jaws, by which motion he could have effected a sufficient change of expression. No later writer on the subject appears to have found such a supposition probable. I know of only one passage in an ancient author which might possibly lend color to Boettiger's theory: that is in the Onomasticon of Pollux (IV, 133) and is a description of a tragic mask: 'Ὁ δὲ λευκὸς ἀνὴρ, πᾶς μὲν ἐστὶ πολὺς, βόστρουχοι δὲ περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν. καὶ τὸ γένειον πεπηγὸς, καὶ προσπετὴς ὀφρὺς καὶ παράλευκον τὸ χρῶμα, ὁ δὲ ὄγκος, βραχύς. To infer from this that the chin of a mask was sometimes movable seems to me *exceedingly* questionable. On the contrary, there are evidences that the expression could not generally be changed in this way, for sometimes the two sides of a mask were made with different expressions, one side to be turned to the audience at one time, the

vultus was used by Terence of the face and not merely of the head or in the sense of 'bearing', 'mien', Hoffer thinks he has shown by citing other cases of the word in the comedies of Terence. The instances adduced are And. 119, 839, 857; Haut. 887; Ph. 890; Hec. 369; but in five of these passages (And. 119, 839, 857; Haut. 887; Hec. 369) the word is used of persons not present on the stage, while the sixth (Ph. 890) does not fully justify Hoffer's confidence in its testimony.¹ In Plautus especially there are numerous references to weeping, growing pale, etc., but they seem no more significant than similar cases in the modern theater—indeed, perhaps less significant, for in later times, at least, the Roman theater was vastly larger than ours.

The presence of masks in the illustrated MSS. of Terence is no argument for the early use of *personae* on the Roman stage, especially since more recent investigations tend to indicate a much later date for the archetype of those MSS. than Leo asserted for them a quarter of a century ago.² Moreover, every new examination of the recent photographic reproductions of the miniatures is yielding an increasing body of evidence for the unreliability of the pictures in matters of detail. In connection

other at another time. In Quintilian II. 3. 74, after a reference to tragic masks, we find the following words: In comoediis vero praeter aliam observationem, qua servi, lenones, parasiti, rustici, milites, meretriculae, ancillae, senes austeri ac mites, iuvenes severi ac luxuriosi, matronae, puellae inter se discernuntur, pater ille, cuius praecipuae partes sunt, quia interim concitatus, interim lenis est, altero erecto altero composito est supercilio; *atque id ostendere maxime latus actoribus moris est, quod cum iis, quas agunt, partibus congruat.*

¹ The most striking case which I recall from Plautus of change in facial expression is in the mad scene of the *Menaechmi* (828-875). Here a large part of the expression is in the eyes of Menaechmus II (it was to the effect on ocular expression, be it remembered, that Cicero represented the *senes* as especially objecting in connection with the use of masks: *De Orat.* III. 59. 221). A similar description of madness occurs in *Captivi* 594 ff. Of both these passages it may be said that the points noted are part of the standing diagnosis of *insania* among the Greeks and the Romans . . . At first sight a change of expression from grave to gay seems to be implied in *Ter. Eun.* 304, but the editors generally take *alacris* as = *commotus*.

² Whereas Leo (*Rh. Mus.* 38 [1883], 341 ff.) placed the archetype of C, P, F, and O between about 39 B. C. and 79 A. D., Bethe (*Terenti Codex Ambrosianus* H 75 inf. phototypice editus, 1903, Praef. 51-64) thinks it could not have been earlier than the second century A. D., while Dr. Otto Engelhardt (*Die Illustrationen der Terenzhandschriften*, Jena, 1903, pp. 83-92) would make the date as late as the end of the fifth, or the beginning of the sixth, century A. D.

with masks even more than in the case of stage costume,¹ for example, is their testimony disappointing. In Pollux, *Onomasticon* IV. 143-154, we have a list of forty-four masks used in the New Comedy and numerous other types not described by Pollux are said to be extant in various collections of antiquities. Of course we cannot be sure that the latter types were used on the stage; neither can we be positive that Pollux's account of scenic matters can be applied to the Roman stage in an early period. Still, we have a right to expect some variety and individuality in the masks of the Terentian miniatures, if they really represent those used in stage-productions of the plays. As a matter of fact, in all reliable reproductions of the miniatures at hand there are only two broad classes of masks to be distinguished; the grotesque, big-mouthed type, found on slaves, old men, parasites and comic characters generally, and the naturally formed type, generally found on women and young men.² Of the best illustrated MSS., C and F are very consistent in observing this differentiation, P sometimes uses the large-mouthed mask for women, O always assigns it to old men and slaves and generally to all other characters, the exceptions in the last case being entirely irregular and inconsistent.³ The use of the beard is quite as variable; it almost never accompanies the naturally formed mask, but its use with the grotesque mask varies: in O almost all the men's masks are bearded, in F the beard is seldom used, in C and P the practice wavers, even varying from scene to scene for a given character. It is no less difficult to generalize as to the modes of hair-dressing in the miniatures. In the *Aediculae* the masks are, of course, larger and more carefully drawn than in the miniatures, but, again, their testimony is vitiated by its incompleteness and even more by its inconsistency: e. g., the number of masks for a given play sometimes differs in the different MSS.,⁴ or, when the names of the characters are

¹ Cf. Costume in Roman Comedy (see above, p. 58, n. 1), pp. 13-16.

² This subject is presented at greater length by Dr. Engelhardt (l. c., pp. 40-47).

³ Sometimes O shows a young man or a woman in a large-mouthed mask and, in the next scene, in a naturally formed mask.

⁴ Before the *Adelphoe* F shows 8 masks (without *aedicula*), C 13 masks (8 with large mouths, 5 with mouths naturally formed). Not only are these inconsistent with each other but with the play itself, in which there are 7 characters that might be expected to wear the grotesque mask and 7 women and

assigned to the various masks of an *aedicula*, the assignments are not always correctly made.¹

We may summarize briefly, then, as follows:

(1) There are several Roman traditions pointing to the introduction of masks between the time of Terence and that of Cicero; on the other hand, there are no ancient traditions for the use of masks from the beginning of Roman Comedy, nor do the extant comedies themselves demand masked players.

(2) The exact date of the innovation cannot be given, though the *terminus post quem non* is 91 B. C. (the date of the dialogue in the *De Oratore*) and the *terminus ante quem non* should, if the commonly accepted views of Dziatzko (see pp. 61-2) are granted, be reduced to the first year of the floruit of Minucius Prothymus. In view of the large range of time within which the absence of positive evidence prevents us from defining that floruit with any certainty, we can only conjecture with Ribbeck that Minucius Prothymus and Roscius were contemporaries or with van Wageningen that Minucius Prothymus was the Greek who introduced the unpopular innovation, the final establishment of which, in the minds of all Romans, was really due to the younger actor, the Roman Roscius. In either case we are bound to take into account the undoubted influence of the Greek stage in the years following the momentous conquests of 146 and 130 B. C. That the date was probably later than 130² is a natural inference from *De Oratore* 3. 59. 221 (see above, p. 59).

young men . . . Before the Hecyra F. shows no masks, C 11 (6 of old men, 5 of women and young men); but the Hecyra has 6 women and young men and only 2 old men and 2 *servi* . . . Before the Phormio C and P show 13 masks in three rows, F 8 masks (without *aedicula*) in two rows: in C and P there are 6 grotesque masks and 7 naturally formed, but the play requires 9 of the former and 4 of the latter (even if Hegio and Crito are to be regarded as young men, there is still a discrepancy between the number of masks and the requirements of the play).

¹ For example, in the *Andria* P shows a mask for Glycerium, whose voice is heard only from the background, one for Chrysis, who died before the opening of the play, one for Archylis who very possibly does not appear on the stage at all, no mask for Chremes and a grotesque mask for Pamphilus *Adulescens*.

² Ribbeck (*Röm. Trag.* 661) placed the innovation between the years 114 and 104 B. C. and with these termini Mueller agrees (*Hermann's Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten*, III. 2. 288, n. 1 end): Teuffel-Schwabe I⁵, 25, say about 114 B. C. Their argument seems to be that a generation before 91 B. C.

I have said that this innovation on the Roman stage was probably due to Greek influence. Many writers on the ancient theater state that the object in using masks was to increase the carrying power of the actor's voice. This question has been discussed at length by Otto Dingeldein,¹ who seems to have shown the falsity of such a theory. Nowhere in Greek literature, he says, is such a power assigned to masks, and it certainly could not have belonged to the first masks, which were made of leaves, bark or linen: in Latin literature the false theory is supported by a single passage from a good period, Gellius 5. 7: *Lepide mi hercules et scite Gavius Bassus in libris quos de origine vocabulorum composuit, unde appellata 'persona' sit, interpretatur: a personando enim id vocabulum factum esse coniectat. Nam caput, inquit, et os coperimento personae tectum undique unaque tantum vocis emittendae via pervium, quoniam non vaga neque diffusa est, [set] in unum tantummodo exitum collectam coactamque vocem ciet, magis claros canorosque sonitus facit. Quoniam igitur indumentum illud oris clarescere et resonare vocem facit, ob eam causam 'persona' dicta est, o littera propter vocabuli formam productiore.* On the other hand the famous Diomedes passage, going back to Varro, says nothing about the strengthening of the voice but implies that Roscius's squint was responsible for his use of masks.² The traditional view of the origin and continuance of the practice among the Greeks³ is clearly put by

(i. e. 124 B. C.) the *senes* of Crassus's day saw actors playing without masks, but that masks came in shortly after that time, probably within the next ten years. Schanz (Röm. Lit., Müller's Hdb. VIII. I. 1³, 197) says "Im Jahre 91 war sie bereits vor nicht gar langer Zeit eingeführt worden". However, since Crassus may be interpreted as implying that he and his contemporaries, unlike the *senes*, had never been accustomed to seeing actors performing regularly unmasked (Scaenica Romana, 37), those authorities seem more reasonable who put the innovation back a considerable number of years before 91 B. C.

¹ In a paper entitled *Haben die Theatermasken der Alten die Stimme verstärkt?*, Berliner Studien für Class. Philol. u. Archaeologie, 11, pp. 1-46.

² Cf., however, Dr. Basore's estimate of this view, A. J. P. XXIX 225.

³ The uniform use of masks on the Greek stage has until very recently been accepted without question. Even in the last edition of Haigh's *Attic Theatre* (Pickard-Cambridge, 1907, p. 262) no doubt is expressed as to the old tradition. However, scholars are beginning to feel that the evidence for their use in the classical period is not altogether conclusive. See F. L. Hutson's review of Hense's *Die Modificirung der Maske in der griechischen Tragödie*

Dr. Albert Mueller in the following words: "Zum dramatischen Costüm gehörte auch die Maske. Dieselbe stammte von der an den dionysischen Festen, aus welchen das Drama entstanden ist, üblichen Farbung und Vermummung des Gesichtes, da es nun natürlich war dass die Person, welche den Gott darstellte, das eigene Gesicht unkenntlich zu machen suchte. Auch später scheinen bei festlichen Gelegenheiten manche Priester die Maske ihrer Gottheit getragen zu haben. . . . Getragen von religiöser Scheu, hielt sich der Gebrauch der Masken bis in die späteste Zeit,¹ und man übersah das in der Maske liegende Unnatürliche um so eher, als die Schauspieler einerseits bei den mehr typischen als individuellen Gestalten der Tragödie im Stande waren, das ganze Stück hindurch eine Grundstimmung festzuhalten, anderseits unter der Maske sich leichter den oft allen Anstand überschreitenden Scherzen der Komödie hinzugeben vermochten".¹

CATHARINE SAUNDERS.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

(Class. Philol. 3. 458-459) and A. W. Verrall's review of Kelley Rees's *The Rule of the Three Actors in the Classical Greek Drama* (Class. Rev. 23. 191 ff.).

¹ Mueller, l. c., pp. 270-272.